

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/854,082	LARSON, JAMES	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Raymond W. Addie	3671	

All Participants:

(1) Raymond W. Addie.

(2) _____.

Status of Application: _____

(3) Alexander Vodovozov.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 February 2006

Time: 12:00 PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

102(b) to Saunders '376 and potential new rejections based on Mason et al. # 4,768,617.

Claims discussed:

1-13

Prior art documents discussed:

Saunders '376, Mason et al. '617 Stine # 3,845,591

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Applicant's rep. to discuss the amendment to the claims filed 12/15/05, which appeared to be a bona fide attempt to amend the claims around the prior art of record. After discussion of the patentable issues in the case, with the Examiner and separately with Applicant; Applicant's rep. faxed a proposed amendment adding some subject matter of claim 6 into the body of independent claim 1. The proposed amendment clearly defines the structural relationship between the inclinable gangway and the gangway corridor unit, in a manner that is not contemplated, or taught by any of the prior art of record. Therefore, an Examiner's Amendment has been made to the claims, in accordance with Applicant's proposed changes. .